



Defendants Nos. 773, 821, 832, 907, 913, 919, 775, as identified in Schedule “A” to the Complaint (DE 0011-007), disclose pursuant to Rule 7.1 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that Suzhou Chenghe Network Technology Co., Ltd. is their controlling company.

Defendant No. 916, as identified in Schedule “A” to the Complaint (DE 0011-007), discloses pursuant to Rule 7.1 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that Vedo Trading Co., Limited is its controlling company.

Defendants Nos. 704, 800, as identified in Schedule “A” to the Complaint (DE 0011-007), disclose pursuant to Rule 7.1 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that Suzhou Ruoxing Network Technology Co., Ltd. is their controlling company.

Defendants Nos. 714, 847, as identified in Schedule “A” to the Complaint (DE 0011-007), disclose pursuant to Rule 7.1 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that Shenzhen Jiayi E-Commerce Co., Ltd. is their controlling company.

Defendant No. 754, as identified in Schedule “A” to the Complaint (DE 0011-007), discloses pursuant to Rule 7.1 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that Vanice Technology Co., Limited is its controlling company.

Defendant No. 763, as identified in Schedule “A” to the Complaint (DE 0011-007), discloses pursuant to Rule 7.1 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that Starcraft Network Limited is its controlling company.

Defendant No. 785, as identified in Schedule “A” to the Complaint (DE 0011-007), discloses pursuant to Rule 7.1 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that Sonzea Trading Co., Limited is its controlling company.

Defendants Nos. 702, 914, 927, as identified in Schedule “A” to the Complaint (DE 0011-007), disclose pursuant to Rule 7.1 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that Dongguan Hengjia E-Commerce Co., Ltd. is their controlling company.

Defendants Nos. 786, 817, 825, 871, as identified in Schedule “A” to the Complaint (DE 0011-007), disclose pursuant to Rule 7.1 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that Nanchang Huiyun Linghai Technology Co., Ltd. is their controlling company.

Defendants Nos. 798, 877, as identified in Schedule “A” to the Complaint (DE 0011-007), disclose pursuant to Rule 7.1 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that Banbain Trade Co., Limited is their controlling company.

Defendant No. 840, as identified in Schedule “A” to the Complaint (DE 0011-007), discloses pursuant to Rule 7.1 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that Husdow Technology Co., Limited is its controlling company.

Defendant No. 915, as identified in Schedule “A” to the Complaint (DE 0011-007), discloses pursuant to Rule 7.1 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that Ayor Trading Co., Limited is its controlling company.

Defendants Nos. 772, 880, 917, 923, as identified in Schedule “A” to the Complaint (DE 0011-007), disclose pursuant to Rule 7.1 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that Amgo Technology Co., Limited is their controlling company.

Defendants Nos. 713, 839, as identified in Schedule “A” to the Complaint (DE 0011-007), disclose pursuant to Rule 7.1 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that Elay E-commerce Co., Limited is their controlling company.

Defendant No. 715, as identified in Schedule “A” to the Complaint (DE 0011-007), discloses pursuant to Rule 7.1 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that Danceage Network Limited is its controlling company.

Defendants Nos. 728, 765, 803, 909, 879, as identified in Schedule “A” to the Complaint (DE 0011-007), disclose pursuant to Rule 7.1 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that Zero-Miracle Network Limited is their controlling company.

Defendants Nos. 780, 818, 819, 878, 883, as identified in Schedule “A” to the Complaint (DE 0011-007), disclose pursuant to Rule 7.1 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that Shenzhen Jijing Network Technology Co., Ltd. is their controlling company.

Defendants Nos. 822, 910, as identified in Schedule “A” to the Complaint (DE 0011-007), disclose pursuant to Rule 7.1 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that Nanchang Huimeng Network Technology Co., Ltd. is their controlling company.

Defendants Nos. 858, 888, 922, as identified in Schedule “A” to the Complaint (DE 0011-007), disclose pursuant to Rule 7.1 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that Nanchang Sikerui Technology Co., Ltd. is their controlling company.

Defendant No. 891, as identified in Schedule “A” to the Complaint (DE 0011-007), discloses pursuant to Rule 7.1 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that Nanchang Laifei Technology Co., Ltd. is its controlling company.

Defendant No. 904, as identified in Schedule “A” to the Complaint (DE 0011-007), discloses pursuant to Rule 7.1 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that Wuhan Quanda Network Technology Co., Ltd. is its controlling company.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 2, 2023

Giuliano Law Group, P.A.

/s/ Nicole W. Giuliano

Nicole W. Giuliano, Esq.

Florida Bar No. 71067

121 S. Orange Avenue, Suite 1500

Orlando, FL 32801

Tel: (321) 754-5290 / Fax: (321) 400-1055

Primary: [nicole@glgpa.com](mailto:nicole@glgpa.com)

[service@glgpa.com](mailto:service@glgpa.com)

DGW KRAMER LLP

By: /s/ Katherine Burghardt Kramer

Katherine Burghardt Kramer, Esq.

*Pro hac vice*

DGW KRAMER LLP

One Rockefeller Plaza, 10th Fl.

Suite 1060

New York, NY 10020

T: (917) 633-6860

[kkramer@dgwllp.com](mailto:kkramer@dgwllp.com)

*Attorney for Certain Defendants Nos. 720, 743, 769, 781, 831, 870, 906, 911, 912, 918, 924, 735, 767, 778, 773, 821, 832, 907, 913, 919, 775, 916, 704, 800, 714, 847, 754, 763, 785, 702, 914, 927, 786, 817, 825, 871, 798, 877, 840, 915, 772, 880, 917, 923, 713, 839, 715, 728, 765, 803, 909, 879, 780, 818, 819, 878, 883, 822, 910, 858, 888, 922, 891, 904.*